

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are currently pending. Claim 1 has been amended.

I. The Restriction Requirement

The Examiner states that claims 6 and 7 are directed to a method of making a polishing slurry (Group II) and the originally elected invention is directed to a polishing slurry composition (Group I). The Examiner also states that Applicants have constructively elected Group I by original presentation.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's restriction requirement. The instant application is a National Stage Application of a PCT filed under 35 U.S.C. § 371. Therefore, the "unity of invention" standard must be used for the restriction requirement.

I. The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 1 has been amended for clarity. As to claims 1-5, Applicants respectfully submit that the term "film type filter" is known in the art.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are clear and definite as written and that they particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

II. The Art Rejections

Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Pasqualoni et al. (671).

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Pasqualoni et al. (671).

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Uchino et al. (206).

Claims 1-2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kido et al. (836).

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Kido et al. (836).

Claims 1-2, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Yoshida et al. (118).

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Yoshida et al. (118).

These rejections are substantially the same as the rejections set forth in the Office Action date January 15, 2008. Applicants respectfully traverse the instant rejections for the same reasons as set forth in the Amendment dated May 15, 2008, which is hereby incorporated by reference.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of claims 1-7 is neither taught by nor made obvious from the disclosures of Pasqualoni et al. (671), Uchino et al.

(206), or Kido et al. (836) and it is requested that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that their claimed invention is allowable and ask that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103 be reconsidered and withdrawn. Applicants respectfully submit that this case is in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully solicited.

If any points remain at issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the local exchange number listed below.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Lee C. Wright
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,441
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

LCW/af